

Two SUCI Organisers of Purulia Murdered

RED SALUTE TO

**Com. RAMJATAN SINGH and
Com. GUHIRAM BAURI !**

To deprive the share-croppers, poor peasants of their rightful shares of harvest—incidents of on slaughts, loots by the jotedars, land owners are not new in independent India. But this year this has taken a new dimension in magnitude and cruelty.

names—but till 6th of December no arrests have been made.

This incident of gruesome murder of the renowned peasant leaders of KKMf have created great commotion and indignation in the whole of Neturia-Raghunathpur area.

MARTYRS



Ramjatan Singh

The death of Comrade Ramjatan Singh and Comrade Guhiram Bauri, two important organisers of SUCI of Purulia District at the hands of the anti-social elements backed by the Raj family of Kishipur in connivance with a political party connected with the vested interest—is a glaring example of gruesome murder. On 4th December 1975 when Comrades Ramjatan Singh and Guhiram Bauri were engaged in harvesting in the village Mekatola of Janardandi Anchal under Neturia Police Station of Purulia District, bombs were hurled at them and when they fell on the ground were chopped with rangis to death at broad day light.

It is striking to note here that the police were priorily intimated twice of such a possibility—but no action was taken by the police to prevent such incident.

Moreover, eye-witnesses have lodged complaints against the miscreants giving details of their



Guhiram Bauri

Immediately after the news reached the state head quarter, Comrades Sukomal Dasgupta and Ranajit Dhar, members of Secretariat of the West Bengal State Committee of SUCI rushed to the place of occurrence.

Comrade Nihar Mukherjee, Secretary, West Bengal State Committee of SUCI has in an urgent letter drawn the attention of the Prime Minister of India and the Chief Minister of West Bengal to this grave and tragic incident—which is just one of many that are occurring in various parts of the State of West Bengal during the present harvesting season.

Comrade Mukherjee demanded in his letter that the Government take immediate measures to arrest the culprits, bring them to books and give exemplary punishment and to ensure the security of the share-croppers, agricultural labourers and poor peasants.

Proletarian Era

ORGAN OF SOCIALIST UNITY CENTRE OF INDIA (FORTN GHTLY)

Editor-in-Chief—Shibdas Ghosh

VOL 9
No. 8

15th DECEMBER '75
MONDAY

PRICE 30 P.
Air Surcharge 4 P.

UTUC (Lenin Sarani) Leaders meet the Governor of West Bengal

Calcutta 10th December 1975 : As a culmination of of the Protest programme week, from 1st December to 7th December and the State-wide Protest Day on 8th December, 1975 decided at a big Convention of workers and employees held on 17th November '75 at the Calcutta University Institute Hall, a five member delegations on behalf of

West Bengal State Committee of UTUC (Lenin Sarani) consisting of Comrades Fatick Ghosh, Ashutosh Banerjee, Sitiesh Dasgupta, Sanat Dutta and Amar Roy, being invited at a meeting met the Governor of West Bengal to-day.

The delegation submitted a memorandum to the Governor.

... ..
... ..
... ..

The Governor after a prolonged discussion over the issues contained in the memorandum assured the delegation that he would enquire about the raised issues from the concerned authorities and take necessary steps.

SUCI Supporters Receive Bullet Injuries Fired By Jotedars

On the morning of 29th November last, the money-lender jotedar Gunasindhu Barik together with the notorious gundas Banamali Oria, Gurupada Tung, Radhakanta Singh and 4/50 other miscreants armed with bow and arrows, spears and even with guns and other lethal

weapons went to loot the crop of the bargadar Sri Ananta Kumar Das of Indranarayanpur, Gada Mathura Chaturtha Khanda P. S. Patharpratima. When the news reached the village, the peasants and the villagers under the leadership of SUCI workers went to

resist this attempt. Despite the apathy and indifference in joint movements on the part of the leadership of CPI (M), the local CPI (M) peasant workers stood beside the SUCI workers.

(Contd. to Page 8)

West Bengal Government's Ban On Wall-Writing Com. Nihar Mukherji's Letter to the Chief Minister AN OPEN LETTER

To

Shri Siddhartha Shankar Roy,
Chief Minister,
Government of West Bengal,
Writers Buildings,
Calcutta.

17th November, '75

Dear Siddhartha Babu,

Your Government has taken a curious step for 'beautifying Calcutta' by imposing ban on wall-writings, pasting of posters and bills on walls and hanging of banners in the street. Police personnels have already been deployed to whitewash wall-writings. You know best how beautiful Calcutta would become in this way.

If Calcutta—a city with long and glorious democratic tradition is to be made really beautiful, healthy and habitable for a civilised people, we hope you would agree that other problems aside, it is first of all necessary to improve the hygienic condition of the city. Even in this age of tremendous development of science, and civilization

(Contd. to Page 7)

National Income And Related Issues

National Income & Related Issues.

In a bourgeois society National Income Estimates reflects at best a general trend in the economy. The game of averages makes a cruel joke on the socially deprived vast multitude of humanity. The society is class-divided. The average of growth in national income conceals instead of revealing the true condition of the producers whose products are alienated and monopolised by a particular class—the capitalists who own the means of production.

Yet the statistical data provided by the Central Statistical Organisation in its 'quick estimates' about national income for 1973-74 as a survey for a decade past and those by the Economic Times for 1974-75 analysed in the perspective of other relevant data speak of almost a stagnant growth but this too, not with social justice as has been the claim over the years, but just the contrary, with increasing social injustice.

What Should Growth Really Mean.

Bourgeois economists have identified economic development or progress with economic growth measured in terms of rise in average per capita income or product (NNP) and the gross income or product of the Nation as a whole (GNP). In a bourgeois society it is a cruel joke indeed when the poor who constitute more than fifty percent of the Nation and who have a consumption expenditure on an average of paltry thirty five paise per day are told that according to statistical estimate they 'have consumption expenditure of above ten rupees on an average, Statistical data are, therefore paraded to hide the ugly spots that lie underneath the surface. The palpable absurdity is deliberately overlooked.

But the points of interest can not be confined only to how much product has been possible by the social labour. It should reach the real regions of enquiry as to how far development connotes, meeting the fundamental necessities of men in a society like—expansion of employment opportunity, ever-rising consumption standard, constantly rising social security, steady improvement in health, hous-

ing, sanitation, transport and other civic amenities, working conditions, freedom of choice, equity in the distribution of fruits of social labour, ethical and cultural development etc. The National Income Statistics prepared by C.S.O. or Economic Times hardly meet this requirement.

In spite of all these deficiencies and therefore of very limited nature of their significance, let us see even what these statistical data suggest.

What Do All The Statistics Imply

The Reserve Bank of India in an analysis ("Estimates of National Product And Related Aggregates 1973-74"—RBI Bulletin—August '75) has examined the quick estimates of national income for 1973-74 as well as the statistical data for a longer period between 1960-61 to 1972-73 of C.S.O. The picture that comes from those data are the following :

Drop in Growth Rate

a). The quick estimates for 1973-74 shows an increase of 3.1 p. c. in the national income (NNP) over the year. The recovery in national income (at constant prices, i. e. '60-61 price level) from Rs. 19,130 crores in 1972-73 to Rs. 19,724 crores in 1973-74 was mainly the result of an increase of 7.5 p.c. in food grains production coupled with a rise of 8.4 p.c. in the output of oil seeds that led to increase of 6.4 p.c. in the share of agricultural sector in national income.

b). The national income (NNP) of India (at 1960-61 price level) at Rs. 19,130 crores in 1972-73 recorded a marginal decline or 0.9 p.c. over the year as against an increase of 1.4 p.c. in 1971-72.

With an estimated rise of 2.3 p.c. in population in 1972-73 the per capita national income declined by 3.2 p.c. during 1972-73 over and above the decline of 1.0 p.c. observed in 1971-72.

c). The drop in the rate of growth comes in bolder relief when we consider per capita income. The per capita income in 1973-74, at Rs. 340.1 though representing a growth of 0.8 p.c. over 1972-73 was less than its level in 1970-71 over the period 1960-61 to 1973-74. The annual compound growth rates of real per capita income were 1.8 p.c. in the first Plan and 2.9 p.c. in the Second Plan, 2.3 p.c. in the First four years of the Fourth Plan between 1964-65 and 1973-74 i.e. over almost a whole decade, the per capita real income has remained virtually static. Thus it reflected "a slower growth rate than that envisaged in this decade of planning".

d). The share of agriculture (primary sector) remains still dominant, being "largest constituent of net national product". The share of Primary sector remained round 40 to 45 p.c. whereas the share of manufacturing sub-sector improved slightly from 13.9 p.c. in 1960-61 to 16.8 p.c. in 1965-66 but did not show any appreciable improvement thereafter.

Dropping Capital Formation.

e). Domestic saving as proportion of net national product at current price reached a peak of 13.1 p.c. in 1966-67; thereafter it has never touched the level so far. The RBI estimates place the savings ratio at 12.6 p.c, 12.2 p.c. and 11.8 p.c. in 1972-73, 1973-74 and 1974-75 respectively.

The proportion of national expenditure devoted to capital formation determines the extent of the use of capacity created in industries producing basic and capital goods. The future production potential of the economy also depends upon

such investment expenditure. RBI data show that whereas the rate was 15.5 p.c. in 1960-61 it came down to 12.2 p.c. in 1971-72.

The quick estimate prepared by *Economic Times* (Nov. 27, '75) about 'Trends In National and per Capita Income' for 1974-75 puts the Total Net Product figure at Rs. 20 040 crores (Rs. 19,724 crores according to C.S.O. for 1973-74) and as such an increase in India's national income by only 1.6 p.c. in real terms. The quick estimate also shows a fall in net product of agriculture by 1.4 p.c. said to have been offset by an increase in net product of manufacturing by 2.1 p.c.

Now, what we find from all these statistical figures in clear terms? We find that (a) Indian growth rate if even 3 p. c. be taken as an average is even lower than the average rates for all developing countries which were 4.7 p. c. in 1950-60 and 5.2 p.c. during 1960-70. And so, the chronic under-nutrition mal-nutrition consequent on appalling poverty of the masses is no nearer solution than where it had been 28 years ago. And as one writer puts it; "India is to-day not merely among the poorest countries in the world, it has almost half of the total population of the countries classified as the 'poorest' by the Industrial Development Association (IDA) of the world Bank. And continuation of these trends for another 25 years will mean.....perhaps the world's largest human mass for which extreme poverty continues to be a daily experience."

(Economic Political Weekly, vol, IX, No, 13 March 30, 1974).

b). The overall growth of the country is still principally determined by the levels of agricultural production as it was in 1950-51 i.e. before economic planning commenced. And agricultural production on its part still remains a whim of nature. The change in percentage of share by agricultural sector

in national product has been due to rise or fall in the production of agricultural product as would be obvious from the data we have quoted. One simply wonders as to what is the meaning of planned development if it is not to change the share of agriculture in favour of industry as growth generator and free agriculture from abject dependence on nature, either.

c). The growth in agriculture is not so much due to increase in physical production but for rise in prices which has been higher than that of manufactured articles. The secondary sector has increased its share from 16 p. c. in 1950-51 to 23 p. c. in 1965-66 and has continued around the figure since then, showing stagnancy in industrial production. The trade and transport sector has increased from 12 p. c. in 1950-51 to 14 p. c. in 1960-61 and 16 p. c. in 1973-74. The pattern remains almost the same both at current and constant prices.

d) "The examination of the results suggest that over the period the individual consumers have been affected most by the rise in prices and the overall increase in price has been as much as 110 p. c. over the period of study (1950-51 to 1973-74) giving an annual average increase of a little over 9 p. c. The effect of price rise has been least for salaries and wages.....or in other words such payments have not neutralised the rise in prices over the period." This is also to be examined in the perspective of the fact that a verage consumption expenditure has risen due to inflation, from Rs. 281 in 1960-61 to Rs. 298.6 in 1972-75. Instead of an increase therefore, there has been a deterioration in living standard.

e). The analysis of the long period data available so far do not show very definite signs of either the structural shift or increasing/decreasing trends in production, con-

Contd. to Page 3)

National Income And Related Issues

(Contd. from Page 2)

sumption and capital formation. This is mainly due to the uncertain behaviour of agriculture which will continue to play a very important role in determining the overall trend of production in the country.

Consumption power of the Masses—The Market

In a capitalist economy based on motive of maximum profit and exploitative production relation, poor consumption power of the masses or in other words the market barrier is both a cause as well as an effect. In our country, after decades of planned development, the law of capitalist production has worked fully. The market base or in other words the purchasing power of the masses has further been narrowed down due to further aggravation in the inequality of distribution of incomes or consumption by the very law of capitalist production as well as the fiscal tools. Revealing the inherent contradiction of capitalist law of production, this ever narrowing base of market has been the biggest disincentive to urge for capital investment and as a result, we find an almost stagnant industrial sector. Before we can go to the question in depth, let us present a few figures to show the grave social injustice that has been associated with our endeavour to planned development.

(i). Unemployment

According to official estimates employment in the organised sector expanded by 2.4 p.c. in 1974 compared to 4.1 p.c. in 1973 the slow down in employment growth is unmistakable even when a long range view is taken....it was at a compound rate of 6. p.c. between 1960-61 and 196-66—in not a single year since then the rate was near the figure.

The number of job-seekers on the registers of employment exchange rose from 4.06 million in 1970 to 8.7 million by May '75.

The number of educated jobseekers rose even faster from 1.82 million to 4.1 million in the same period. This shows the failure to create employment opportunities outside agriculture to keep pace with the number of job seekers. This means in other words more overcrowding in rural economy, more people becoming absolutely dependent on land. (Economic & Political Weekly Oct, 25, '75).

The situation becomes all the more worse with growing rates of retrenchment and closures of industrial units whereas in agricultural sector concentration of land holdings in the hands of rural bourgeoisie or the Jotedars and growing rate of eviction of share-croppers raised the percentage of landless labourers to about 27 on an all-India average according to 1971 census. The figures are as high as 38 p.c. or round that in many parts of the country. The National Sample Survey (NSS) report of the 17th round indicates that 83 million rural households are landless. The Mishra Estimate indicated the number of unemployed person in rural sector to have grown to 23 million at the end of 4th Plan. This falls far short of depicting the existing reality. Destitution of poor peasants has swelled the ranks of landless labours at a faster rates particularly in recent years.

(G P. Mishra—Economic Times—May 30, 1972).

(ii) Consumption—Distribution patterns.

As a result of unemployment, under-employment, high inflationary trend in the economy and incidence of indirect taxation, the distribution of consumption power has been very much uneven. We quote a telling figure from the materials of the N.S.S. report for 1963-64. The position has not been reversed rather further accentuated in more recent years although figures are not available.

Consumption

Lowest 40% of the earning group of population.	19.7% of total consumption
Next 30% of the earning group of population.	53.2% of total consumption
Highest 10% of the earning group of population.	27.1% of total consumption

The Bardhan Estimate of rural poverty in India indicates that the p.c. of the rural population below the poverty line has gone up from 38 p.c. in 1956-57 to 54 p.c. in 1969-70.

(P.K.Bardhan—"On the Incidence of Poverty in Rural India"—Economic & Political Weekly, August 1973).

iii) Incidence of Taxation

Based on government figures of 1964-65, one analyst has examined the incidence of indirect taxation on consumption level in West Bengal (Banamali Dey—Economic & Political Weekly, September 7, 1974).

Sri Dey has presented a data about percentage of tax element included in the consumer expenditure on principal items, sector-wide. We give extract of a portion only, here :

Sri Dey therefore comes to the conclusion that "It is regrettable that the rich and the poor are taxed at the same rate for their consumption of cereals and pulses. Even in the case of the basket of non-cereal food consumption which contains most nutritious food items in large quantities for the rich and the necessary items of standard qualities for the poor the ration of tax shows very little progressiveness. Some discrimination in tax policy is absolutely necessary for shifting the burden at higher rate to the rich. Items like sugar and salt are taxed at higher rates than items like milk product, meat, fish, egg etc. which do not find place in the dishes of the poor and even many of the middle class people, should bear a lower rate."

Sector

Items	Rural	Urban
Cereals	1.8	2.8
Pulses	0.3	0.3
Sugar, Gur Khandesan'	25.5	26.5
Salt	4.0	4.0
Tobacco and products	42.7	44.7
Clothings	20.5	24.6
Medical expenditure	23.6	26.9
Conveyance	47.1	53.1

He observes ; "The average rate of 14 p.c. for the urban and 8 p.c. for rural people has not been very helpful for bridging the wide gap in their consumption". Further, "The rates of tax per unit of consumption of non-cereal food items of the poorest groups of people are 3.7 p.c. for the rural areas and 5.6 p.c. for the urban areas. The corresponding rates for top are 6.0 p.c. and 8.3 p.c. But the annual absolute amounts of tax for richest groups both in rural (Rs. 10.35) and urban (about Rs. 40.00) areas are negligible in respect of their huge consumption".

Yet, the incidence of this inequitable tax burden is increasing so much so that it was 12 paise in each rupee of consumption in 1964-65 and 13 paise in 1968-69. Since then it has been on further increase.

Stagnation in Industry : both the cause and effect

Analysis of capacity utilisation in industries has more than one significance. It gives an insight into the real cause of poor growth in the economy. Three clear benefits that come from any improvement in capacity utilisation are quite known to every body. It raises the growth rate in economy bringing a chain reaction of current output, saving and investment with the capital stock and future output. It also increases the productivity of capital as also employment by requiring multiple shifts in place of single shift in manufacturing unit.

Mr. Samuel Paul, has analysed the question in some details in his study on "Growth and utilisation of Industrial capacity".

(Economic & Political Weekly, Dec.7, '74.)

We would like to cite certain data from his important study. Here are the figures both for annual rate of growth of installed capacity as also the percentage of utilisation of that capacity.

Annual Rate of Growth of Installed Capacity

Period	Consumer goods	Intermediate goods	Capital goods	All industries
1960-1970	3.6	8.3	6.7	5.7
1960-1964	1.9	11.2	9.1	6.1
1964-1967	4.2	8.7	6.6	6.4
1967-1970	5.3	4.0	3.7	4.5

Average Rates (percent) Utilisation of Installed Capacity

Industry	Periods	1961-65	1966-68	1969-70
1. Consumer goods		46.3	48.6	53.0
2. Intermediate goods		64.3	60.9	61.2
3. Capital goods		57.6	42.3	42.8
4. All Industries		53.6	52.1	54.5

(Contd. to Page 6)

THE ISSUE OF BONUS

The issue of bonus has been agitating the minds of the Working people after the government's recent Bonus Ordinance whereby the hitherto guiding principle of accepting bonus as 'deferred wages'.....

These measures have roused bitter reaction even amongst the trade union circles whose loyalty to the government and the bourgeois system was never a suspect.

Take for example, the reaction of Sri Ramanujam, the INTUC boss, in a conference where the Prime Minister was present.....The INTUC boss also could not but express the fear that increased production might spell bigger danger to the workers because there was no protecting measure to save the workers from losing jobs and earnings either temporarily or for longer duration due to lay-off and lockout, the employers were absolutely free to resort to on the ground of glut of goods or recession. Ramanujam is right when he reminds this basic feature of a capitalist economy.

Another leader Mr. Bhagwati held that if bonus as a concept of deferred wages was given up as envisaged in the new bonus ordinance, it would become necessary to think of revising the wage structure.

...Sri Bagaram Tulpule .. in an article "Labours' Right to Bonus" in *Economic and Political Weekly* (October 25, '75) has recounted a short history of bonus and pointed out certain plain facts.....

Tulpule, quotes figures to show the percentage of strikes and lockouts due to bonus disputes increased from 9.0% in 1950 to 12.3% in 1962 reached the highest peak of 14.1% in 1971 and then declined to only 8% in 1972.

The percentages show that bonus disputes never constitute the main cause of industrial unrest in industrial relations....

Moreover, the percentages also show that they were not surely so alarming even though in between the periods the price increase considerably eroded the real wages of the workers and the employees.

Productivity and workers' share.

Tulpule has not however, quoted the figures of money and real earnings of the workers together with increase in production. He would have done well if he did so. Here are those

figures :—

Year	Money earnings.	Real earnings.	Industrial production	Per Capita national earnings.
1961.	100	100	100	100
1966.	139	95	139.7	101.3
1969.		101	158	107.3
1970.	175	98	165.5	110.8
Total p. c. increase from 1961 to 1970	75%	2%	65.6%	10.8%

("Statistical Outlines of India", 1972-73—Tata Service Ltd., Department of Economics & Statistics—quoted in an article in 'Economic Times', August 21, '75).

The reason for this fall in real wages is not far to seek.

"The prices of Commodities have been rising at the rate of 13 percent per annum since 1961-62 ...The index (base: 1961-62=100) stood at 218.4 at the end of the last fiscal year (March 1973). The latest index for Feb 2, 1974 is 272.2, recording a rise of 14.3 percent last year....Between March 1972 and February 2, 1974 the wholesale price index has risen by 41.5 percent, the index for food articles showing a rise of 45.1 percent, and that for industrial raw materials of 80.2 percent".

(Genesis of Current crisis"—G. P. Mishra—'Mainstream,' Nov 4, '74).

One might quote the statistics supplied by the various government agencies as to the increase in productivity and labours' share in it. It can be seen from those statistics that,

"For payment of bonus, especially of minimum bonus, irrespective of

profits, there has not been any increase in the labour costs of industrial and other establishments. On the contrary, inspite of payment of bonus, including statutorily fixed minimum bonus, under the payment of Bonus Act, labour cost have relatively gone down...According to a study conducted by the Reserve Bank of India about performance in 1969-70 of 1501 non-financial non-governmental public limited companies (the study published in RBI Bulletin, April 1972) compared to 1965-66 value of production rose by 44.8 percent in 1969-70 while

in the corresponding period total labour cost (salary, wages, bonus, provident fund contributions and all other expenses for welfare of employees made by the said 1501 companies) rose by only 38.9 percent. Then again, in 1965-66 labours' share in total expenditure of those companies was 14.9 percent which came down to 14.2 percent in 1969-70. Thus labours' share in total expenditure has not increased due to payment of bonus under the Payment of Bonus Act. On the contrary, it has gone down."

"The study conducted by the Reserve Bank of India further shows that profits retained as percentage of profits before tax rose from 18.1 in 1965-66 to 23.3 in 1969-70; in the corresponding period profit after tax as percentage of net worth recorded a rise from 8.8 to 9.3%. So, it is wrong to conclude that payment of bonus, particularly mini-

mum bonus irrespective of profits has resulted in decline in the net return on capital. On the contrary, inspite of payment of bonus, net return on capital had gone up in the period under study by the Reserve Bank of India".

[U.T.U.C.(Lenin Sarani)'s "Replies to the questionnaire" for consideration of the Bonus Review Commission—August 12, '72]

The ASI (Annual Survey of Industries) data also corroborated the findings of the RBI thus :

"Salaries and wages as p.c. of value added have declined from 55.8 p.c. (1960) to 53.3 p.c. in 1969". So, did the National Commission on Labour. It came to the conclusion, "wages cost as a proportion of total costs of manufacture have registered a decline."

Tulpule however notes that,

"The impact of the minimum bonus of 4 percent on the industry and economy of the country over the previous 5 odd years during which the Bonus Act had been in operation, was before the government and the likely repercussions which are now being described as so harmful of a further increase in the minimum to 8.1/3 percent was also presumably considered...."

Further, "The Khadilkar formula was followed almost immediately afterwards by the appointment of the tri-partite body to review the Bonus Act. This body, the Bonus Review Committee, was clearly enjoined to consider *inter alia* the question of raising the quantum of minimum bonus. It is difficult to understand the logic of the Khadilkar formula or of the setting up of the Bonus Commission in 1971 and 1972 if the economic impact of the Bonus Act was so adverse.....

In any case, the majority recommendation of the Bonus Review Committee was predictably in favour of raising the minimum bonus to 8.1/3 percent and this was promptly enforced through

an ordinance, although only on a year to year basis".

HISTORY OF BONUS.

Tulpule,...traces the history of 'bonus' as an achievement of the Indian working people by means of their long and tortuous trade union struggles. His reference to the earliest attempt to make annual bonus as a right enforceable by the workers against the employers in 1924 where the country was under the British Rule was rejected by the Bonus Dispute Committee headed by the Chief Justice of Bombay, is quite interesting.

"But during the Second World War and more so, in the years immediately following the war, the issue came alive again. This time, the workers succeeded through a series of decisions of courts and Tribunals in getting recognition for their claim for an annual bonus as a matter of right."

The various well-known stages of the bonus struggles have been summarised by Tulpule in his article. They are as follows :

i). the formula evolved by the Industrial Court, Bombay, in the year 1949 while adjudicating the dispute in the cotton textile industries in Bombay.

ii). the Labour Appellate Tribunal Formula (Full Bench Formula) laid down in the year 1952, iii) the 5-year Bonus Pact between the Mill Owners' Association, Ahmedabad and the Textile Labour Association, Ahmedabad. iv) the Supreme Court decision in 1959 in the Associated Cement Companies dispute in appeal, v) the Bonus Commission recommendation in 1964 and the Bonus Ordinance (modified by the Government—not mentioned by Tulpule—writer) followed by the Bonus Act, 1965; vi) the Khadilkar formula in 1971; vii). the interim recommendation of the Bonus Review Committee and the amendment to the Bonus Act on the basis of the interim recommendation for the year 1973; and now

The Issue of Bonus

viii) the Bonus Ordinance of 1975.

Tulpule, mentions that the stage (i) above "was the first serious and authoritative effort to evolve a formula for computing the quantum of bonus and it stands to the credit of the Industrial Court that the basic structure of that formula has stood more or less intact for 25 years... what the Labour Appellate Tribunal, the Supreme Court and the Bonus Commission did in stages (ii), (iii) and (iv) above was no more than refinement and elucidation of certain points in the formula". The LAT formula, Tulpule recounts "was the first refinement of the Industrial Court's formula—namely, the determination of the 'available surplus' by deducting 'certain prior charges' from the 'gross profits' for the year, has thus held the field all these years". Its only 'weakness' has been that it lent itself to endless controversies and litigation over what 'prior charges' should be deducted from the gross profit. But Tulpule mentions "the workers and trade unions also questioned the correctness of the employers' statements of accounts even if audited and were reluctant to accept them as showing the correct figure of gross profit. Early tribunal and court awards on bonus do provide instances to show that the suspicions of the unions were not entirely baseless. The suspicions became understandably strong when the workers were faced with the prospect of getting no bonus at all or very low bonus because the employers' accounts showed loss or very low profit".

Tulpule, then, gives a short account of the Ahmedabad Bonus Pact of 1955 which according to him was a "landmark" for "it provided for the first time and by agreement at that, that some minimum bonus should be paid whether or not profit was made and that there should be some ceiling on maximum bonus payable no matter how large the profit"

He further says: "It is also said that it is basically illogical to make bonus payable when no profits are made. It is therefore worth understanding that (a) the practice was the result of successful bipartite collective bargaining many years before the Bonus Commission was set up; (b) it was copied in countless other bipartite agreements in many industries all over the country; (c) the employers' representative on the Bonus Commission, who so jealously guarded their interests in the commission by appending his strongly worded note of dissent to the majority recommendations of the commission on a number of issues, did not dissent from the principle of minimum bonus regardless of profit."

Logic of Minimum Bonus

"Article 43 of the Constitution of India provides that the 'State shall endeavour to secure by legislation or economic organisation or in any other way, to all workers, agricultural, industrial or otherwise work, a living wage, conditions of work ensuring a decent standard of life and full employment, leisure and social and cultural opportunities.

The Fair Wage Committee made a distinction between 'minimum wage, fair wage and living wage'. Fair wage is higher than minimum wage but lower than the living wage. Living wage is that wage which gives to workmen a standard of living that provides not merely for a bare physical subsistence but for the maintenance of health and decency, a measure of frugal comfort and some insurance against the misfortunes of life as well. Let alone living wage, workmen in our country do not even get minimum wage in most cases which according to the Fair Wage Committee must provide not merely for the bare subsistence of life but for the preservation of the efficiency of the worker by providing some measure of education, medical require-

ment and amenities. That more than 40 percent of our people live even below appalling poverty level is a proof that even minimum wage is not paid to our workers. With prices continuously spiralling, the gap between actual wage and living wage is more and more increasing. It is essentially necessary to bridge the gap. Payment of bonus is a means to do it."

[U.T.U.C(Lenin Sarani)'s Replies to questionnaire of BRC]

Tulpule shows that, "it is noteworthy that (a) minimum bonus regardless of profit was integrally coupled with maximum bonus also regardless of profit thus prescribing a *quid pro quo* and (b) that the provisions of set off and set on were intended to mitigate over a period of years the effects of bonuses paid without adequate profits or bonuses restricted by the ceiling despite very high profit. This clearly shows that the negotiators of Ahmedabad knew what they were doing and had not taken leave of their logical faculties. Nor had the members of the Bonus Commission done so".

The Bonus Commission had the following to say, on the point, "However, if there is a maximum so that however high be the profits in a year the workers cannot be given more bonus than at a certain rate expressed in terms of wages, it stands to reason that there should be a minimum also. Labour cannot be expected to accept as reasonable a formula which provides for a ceiling on bonus without also providing for a floor. An arrangement of minimum and maximum would have the added advantage of evading out bonus payment over the years and thus avoid the obvious disadvantage of widely fluctuating bonus, with year in which there may be no bonus at all and others in which bonus would be very large"

(Report of the Bonus Commission para 7,9.)

So, the Bonus Act, 1965 for the first time made it legally obligatory for the employers to pay the minimum bonus of 4 p.c. of the annual basic wage plus D.A or Rs. 40/ which ever is higher. The Bonus Commission's formula for prior charges to determine the 'available Surplus' was modified by the government to diminish the quantum of surplus which Tulpule has not mentioned.

But the 4 p.c. minimum bonus decided by the Bonus Commission unanimously with the consent of even the employers' representative provoked only a mild murmur amongst the employers in general.

The Bonus Review Commission came in the wake of Khadiolkar Formula whereby the then Union Labour Minister R.K. Khadiolkar accepted in 1971 the demand of the workers to enhance the quantum of minimum bonus from 4 p.c. to 8.1/3 p.c. The B.R.C. constituted in 1972, also accepted it in its interim report.

About the new development, Tulpule remarks: "The reduction of the minimum from 8.1/3 percent to 4 per cent for 1974 and its total abolition thereafter, has already provoked expressions of disapproval even from the loyal INTUC and AITUC leaders. But it is not only the trade unions that find themselves in difficulties due to this change. The employers too find themselves in difficulties and embarrassing situation. They had reconciled themselves to paying the minimum of 8.1/3 per cent bonus and realise that cutting it off now will generate acute and potentially costly discontent among workers the emergency notwithstanding."

This is also evident even from the figures of refusal of bonus at 4 p.c. by the workers, given by the West Bengal Chief Minister and Labour Department.

PRODUCTIVITY LINK

Tulpule, rightly points out that the question of linking bonus with productivity is not a new idea mooted. As early as in

1948, the Profit Sharing Committee appointed by the Union Labour Ministry after the Industrial Truce resolution at a special tripartite conference in 1947, had all this to say on the point.

"Conditions of production vary from industry to industry and from undertaking to undertaking within each industry. The productivity equipment and efficiency of organisation and supervision. Then again the measurement of total production in terms of a common unit is a very difficult task. Even the products of an industry or undertaking are not always uniform and easily measurable. To prescribe a norm of annual production is even more difficult. Besides, the basic conditions in any one year may be quite different from the conditions on which the norm has been determined To compare actual production in any given year with the norm would, therefore, be extremely unscientific and unsatisfactory....."

When the Bonus Commission circulated in their questionnaire the same question to elicit the opinions, both the employers and trade unions in one voice expressed themselves against the idea of linking bonus to production and productivity as they found "it would be impractical to do so". The Commission, therefore, came to conclusion: "In view of the objections to the proposals by large sections of employers as well as by almost all the Unions and the practical difficulties inherent in any such proposal we are unable to recommend that the concept of bonus based on profits should be replaced by an annual bonus linked to production or productivity. It is doubtlessly true that properly devised incentive systems in manufacturing concerns form a useful part of the wage structure and would help to increase production, but they cannot be suggested as a substitute to replace the annual profit

(Contd. to Page 7)

National Income And Related Issues

(Contd. from Page 3)

Mr. Paul, has analysed the figures given in the Monthly Statistics of Production (MSP) of the Central Statistical Organisation (CSO) reports about installed capacities of a variety of industries on an engineering basis and comes to the conclusion: "Except for a few continuous process industries reporting is done on a single shift basis." Justifying his findings, Mr. Paul has shown from the CSO report, "only 18 product groups report installed capacity on a three shift basis, seven others report capacity on a two shift basis. The remaining 275 industries or product groups report their installed capacity on a single shift basis. Actually many manufacturing units in the third category operate on a two or three shift basis (as is obvious from the peak output records of these industries which are not possible by the capacity of a single shift) showing thereby that their potential capacity is much in excess of the single shift equivalent.

Mr. Paul has therefore presented comparative figures of the Capacity Utilisation Rate (percent) according to MSP survey of the Central Statistical Organisation based on one shift (under reporting) and the adjusted figures found by re-computing the installed capacity of the industries assuming 2.5 shifts for second and 2 shifts for

third category of industries which is "a conservative estimate."

Mr. Paul is categorical "whether in fact these industries operate on two or three shifts is a different matter.....But the fact remains that they have the potential capacity to operate on more shifts than has been assumed in MSP."

Mr. Paul has posed a few very important and pertinent questions of which the most significant one is "why does a given structure of idle capacity prevail?" We know the question as well as its answer as we are acquainted with the brilliant analysis of our beloved leader and teacher, an eminent Marxist thinker of the era, Comrade Shibdas Ghosh. Comrade Shibdas Ghosh has for long been drawing the attention of the people as also of the official spokesmen to face this basic question, for different reasons of course. For the people, to understand where lies the rot and how to get out of it. But for the intellectual pedlers of bourgeois economy, Comrade Ghosh has thrown the challenge by posing this basic question which, let alone those pedlers, the capitalist law of development has itself failed to answer. Here lies its feet of clay.

But before going to the question as such, which has been dealt with an inimitable lucidity by Comrade Shibdas Ghosh, let us do

justice to our Mr. Paul; some of his findings are important no doubt.

Mr. Paul says; (i). In the initial stage growth of capacity was highest in capital goods and intermediate goods sectors. These represent relatively new industries which started from a relatively small base. It is not surprising.

(2). *The rate of growth of industrial capacity has declined from 6.1 p.c. in 1960-64 to 4.6 p.c. in 1965-70. "This confirms the suspicion of many observers that investment in industry has been on the wane. It is SIGNIFICANT THAT THE RATE OF GROWTH OF CAPACITY SINCE 1961 has been lower than that during the immediately preceding recession period.* This is true also of the capital goods and intermediate goods groups the growth of which appears to have declined substantially since the recession.

3). There has been a steady growth in Consumer Goods Capacity over the decade of the sixties.

Now about the utilisation of industrial capacity, the period of Mr. Paul's study has been between 1961-71. The findings recorded by Mr. Paul are as follow:—

1). "While the rate of capacity utilisation estimated on the basis of the MSP definition of capacity seems impressively high around 80 p. c. when adjusted for multiple shifts...the average utilisation rate is no more than 53 p. c. for the entire period. This indeed is low and shows the tremendous potential for stepping up output simply through fuller utilisation of existing capacity. It would seem that nearly half the industrial capacity in the country has remained unutilised. It is even more disturbing that the level of utilisation has remained more or less stagnant throughout the period under review."

2). In the period 1961-65, the utilisation rate was 54 p. c. which declined to 52 p. c. during the recession period 1966-68 and improved slightly to 54

p. c. again during 1969-71. "It would seem that the difference in performance between the recession and non-recession periods has not been all that significant."

3). In the consumer goods group, utilisation has been steadily improving from 46 p. c. in the first period to 49 p. c. in the second and 53 p. c. in the third, (Since then recessionary trend has been distinctly visible due to high rate of inflation and forced lowering down of purchasing power—writer) "Capital goods at 42-43 p. c. since then." The intermediate groups of industries although showed relatively better results of average capacity utilisation round 60 p. c., they have not been faring well since the recession.

We have presented here, all the empirical studies and their findings which go whole hog to verify the brilliant analysis of Comrade Shibdas Ghosh, our beloved leader and teacher and an eminent Marxist thinker of the era. Comrade Shibdas Ghosh, applying the correct Marxist-Leninist approach, in the concrete situation of our country has for long, been showing to our people that the root cause of the three fundamental socio-economic problems that afflict them so much viz. low agricultural productivity, growing unemployment and stagnation in industrial growth are all related to the fundamental question of removing this moribund capitalist productive system and its exploitative relation of production lock, stock and barrel. As he has shown;

".....uninterrupted development of industry is impossible to-day as social urge for the same is absent due to low purchasing capacity of the people and the continuously squeezing of internal market.....why has the large volume of capital that is being formed in the hands of the land-owning class by the selling of crops and which is being accumulated in the hands of the industrialists

and commercialists in spite of recession become bureaucratic and idle and not invested for industrial development? Not only that, not to speak of new investment in industries, why is it that full utilisation of installed capacity is not possible to day?

"... Why these lay offs? Why do you find regular closure of industries? Why does continuous threat of lay off hang over the working class? What do all these things mean? It means precisely one thing that the installed capacity of industries and the labour-power of the workers are forcibly kept idle. An elementary sense of economics will tell that where there is urge for production, where there is continuous expansion of market such things can never happen. In a poor country like ours where the people can not even meet bare necessities of life the economy is always threatened with the crisis of overproduction due to squeezing of internal market in the event of any attempt to utilise fully the installed capacity of industries. This very crisis of the capitalist system is obstructing the process of mechanisation and modernisation of agriculture. Because, in absence of constant boosting of industry the problem of unemployment in towns and cities is also constantly on the increase.

".....If big farming is introduced and scientific methods are implemented for cultivation then it will augment production no doubt but the question is how will the capitalist economy of India face the challenge of the problem of unemployment? Thus the sole contention of the capitalist is to confine and arrest the majority of the rural population with very small holding of land in a half fed and half-clad condition by preserving the antiquated methods of agriculture".

(Translated version of Comrade Shibdas Ghosh's (Contd. to Page 8)

Rate of capacity utilisation In Indian Industries (1961) (P.C.)

Industry.	Unadjusted (i.e. MSP report)	Adjusted (i.e. recomputed)
1. Food manufacturing industries	63.3	31.6
2. Vanaspati	74.4	74.4
3. Cotton textiles	87.5	50.1
4. Drugs & Pharmaceuticals	53.9	26.9
5. Soaps and Glycerine	72.3	36.1
6. Matches	68.8	34.4
7. Electric Fans	95.2	47.6
8. Heavy organic Chemicals	55.7	36.4
9. Fertilisers	64.9	45.7
10. Steel Pipes and tubes	86.4	69.1
11. Machinery Components and Accessories	87.6	43.8
12. Motor Vehicles	97.7	48.8

(Shortened)

AN OPEN LETTER

(Cont. from Page 1)

heaps of garbage are accumulated and allowed to rot for days and months on, flies and mosquitoes thrive in millions in areas of stagnant water, drains remain choked and are not cleaned for indefinite periods, hydrants run out of water and impure water is supplied as filtered, drinking water. In consequence, malaria, which had been eradicated long back, has reappeared, infectious diseases like pox, cholera and others are breaking out in the form of epidemic every year, threatening public health and progressively taking a huge toll of life of people belonging to the poor and lower middle classes in particular. If your Government had deployed police forces and even military personnel in the manner of wartime emergency to save the citizens from this miserable plight by regularly removing garbage, cleaning drains, eradicating flies and mosquitoes and supplying filtered drinking water, that would have been considered as an effective measure in the direction of restoring public health and thereby the

beauty and health of the city.

Had your Government, instead of entertaining pleas of inefficiency and inability of the authorities concerned, actually taken effective measures for repairing, reconstructing and regularly washing the roads, which for want of necessary repairs long overdue, have become riddled with cracks and holes, creating death-traps, it could have been accepted as sincere attempt to beautify the city in the interest of the citizens.

Now if one considers your Government's drive for beautifying Calcutta by white-washing wall writings, leaving the other vital problems untouched, as a futile attempt at beautification by applying cosmetics to sore, would that appear unreasonable to your Government? We feel constrained to remark with sorrow and annoyance that your Government has precisely taken that direction.

If the step your Government has taken by prohibiting wall writing, poster and so on has any effect at all, it will positively curtail the democra-

tic right of the people to express and propagate their views and political ideologies and mobilise public opinion thereby (not by forcible means).

We demand that if your Government has any real intention to make Calcutta beautiful, healthy and habitable, then take immediate step to relieve the people from the pangs of a hellish atmosphere of garbage, to reconstruct and repair the roads and streets which are now veritable death-holes, promptly remove garbage, keep the sanitary system in order, eradicate flies and mosquitoes and make arrangements for supply of pure, drinking water. At the same time we would strongly demand immediate withdrawal of the method you have adopted to curb the democratic rights of the people to political and ideological campaign by prohibiting wall writing, poster etc, etc.

Prompt reply is solicited,

Thanking you,

Sincerely yours,

Sd/ (Nihar Mukherjee)

Secretary,
West Bengal State
Committee
S.U.C.I.

THE ISSUE OF BONUS

(Contd from Page 5)

sharing bonus....."
(Recommendation 7, page 108).

While giving his opinion, Tulpule also admits that production and productivity depend on a large number of factors like availability of inputs, power supply, market conditions, credit and taxation policies, changing technology and changing product mix, management policies and competence, transport conditions, industrial relations, change in work organisation and so on.

Tulpule holds therefore: "Even if some indices of production and productivity were to be constructed it would be quite impossible to insulate them from the effects of fluctuations in any of the factors in this entire range of factors". Besides, "It is naive in the extreme to

think that the system will be any more rational than the profit based bonus, apart from the fact that the actual computation of the production based bonus will be far more complicated than that of the profit based bonus has been. The former will almost certainly give rise to even more disputes, ill-feeling and actual conflict between employers and employees than the latter has done."

Comrade Fatick Ghosh, General Secretary, UTUC (Lenin Sarani) West Bengal State Committee, has drawn attention to a far more dangerous potentiality of the new proposal as explained. In his speech and the main resolution adopted at the convention of the workers and employees of the state of West Bengal at the University Institute Hall, Calcutta on 17th November '75, it has been

shown:

...	...	...
...	...	...
...	...	...
...	...	...

Tulpule has suggested that when organised industry has by and large, incentive schemes calculated to promote production and productivity, those who have not yet introduced may well introduce the scheme. But that does not justify nullifying "the claim of the employees to a share in the profits to which their efforts have also contributed" and "when for this right the employees fought and won over a quarter of a century ago".

Although, it is quite clear from what Comrade Fatick Ghosh has explained, that we have fundamental difference in our approach to question of bonus from that Tulpule has said. We however agree

From The Manifesto of the Communist Party

—K. MARX and F. ENGELS

From the moment when labour can no longer be converted into capital, money or rent, into a social power capable of being monopolised, i.e. from the moment when individual property can no longer be transformed into bourgeois property, into capital, from that moment, you say, individuality vanishes.

You must therefore confess that by 'individual' you mean no other person than the bourgeois, than the middle class owner of property. This person must, indeed be swept out of the way and made impossible.

Communism deprives no man of the power to appropriate the products of society; all that it does is to deprive him of the power to subjugate the labour of others by means of such appropriation.

It has been objected that upon the abolition of private property all work will cease and universal laziness will overtake us.

According to this, bourgeois society ought long to have gone to the dogs through sheer idleness; for those of its members who work, acquire nothing and those who acquire anything, do

with him when he says:

"The best course might, therefore, be to let the parties bargain and settle their bonus issues without any imposition of external formulas apart from the minimum and maximum. This will, no doubt, involve a certain amount of industrial conflict, but there is no reason to fear that the result of such a procedure will, on balance, be less satisfactory to both sides or to the country's economy than those that may be expected of an externally imposed system which in effect nullifies labours' gains over a quarter century."

...	...	...
...	...	...
...	...	...
...	...	...

not work. The whole of this objection is but another expression of tautology; that there can no longer be any wage labour when there is no longer any capital.

All objections urged against the communistic mode of producing and appropriating material products, have in the same way, been urged against the communistic modes of producing and appropriating intellectual products. Just as to the bourgeois, the disappearance of class property is the disappearance of production itself, so the disappearance of class culture is to him identical with the disappearance of all culture.

That culture, the loss of which he laments, is, for the enormous majority, a mere training to act as a machine.

But don't wrangle with us so long as you apply, to our intended abolition of bourgeois property, the standard of your bourgeois notions of freedom, culture, law etc. Your very ideas are but the out-growth of the conditions of your bourgeois production and bourgeois property, just as your bourgeois jurisprudence is but the will of your class made into a law for all, a will, whose essential character and direction are determined by the economical conditions of existence of your class.

The selfish misconception that induces you to transform into eternal laws of nature and of reason, the social forms springing from your present mode of production and form of property—historical relations that arise and disappear in the progress of production—this misconception you share with every ruling class that has preceded you. What you see clearly in the case of ancient property, what you admit in the case of your own bourgeois form of property.

(TO BE CONCLUDED)

(Contd. from Page 6)

speech—Proletarian Era—
Vol. VII, no. 19, 15th July,
1974)

The Alternatives

After decades of planned development at a colossal sacrifice of our people the performance has been far from being worth the pie. But if we go back to the beginning, we will find that India started her career as a bourgeois democratic sovereign country with some major advantages in the socio-economic fields some of which unparalleled among the developing countries. The most important of these advantages can be easily sorted out. These were i). A fairly large and diversified industrial sector being the most developed among the colonies. At the time of independence, the value of gross industrial output in India ranked within first 8 or 10 in the world.

2). Its industry not only did not suffer any war damage but on the contrary accumulated large resources for modernisation and expansion. In certain goods, India had advantage and outside market viz. Textile, Jute, Tea etc.

3). India inherited unlike other resurgent Asian and African countries a fairly developed physical infrastructure particularly rail and road communication.

4). Moreover Free India started with a huge foreign exchange (Starling) balance created out of lives of lakhs of people who died in Great Bengal Famine as also huge drainage of material resources that went to feed the war efforts of the British imperialists. The huge Capital accumulation would have been a unique advantage to start with for any newly liberated country had it not been simply frittered away in the manner it was done.

5). It had also at its disposal a well-established structure of administration and social services.

National Income And Related Issues

6). The Indian bourgeoisie have been enjoying uninterrupted rule for more than two decades with what they call political stability!

(7). Indian worker is relatively trained and educated and in efficiency measurement is two-third with less than half of the wage rates of his Japanese counterpart.

Even if all these favourable factors as well as the tremendous sacrifices of the people have not been of any use to touch the very fringe of the basic problems of our people, the reasons should be sought in the deeper cause, i.e. in the very capitalist productivity system and the particular historic phase that it is passing through.

Comrade Shibdas Ghosh our beloved leader and teacher and an eminent Marxist thinker of this era has taught us:

The world capitalist system is now in the midst of a severe crisis. This crisis is not of an ordinary type which it had to face so often in the past but is distinctly different. Before the Second World War, the world capitalist system was passing through crisis intermittently, in a cyclical pattern. It had to pass through the long-drawn, most painful experiences of the Great Depression of the thirties. But in spite of all this, and thousands of other odds, it still enjoyed relative stability of world capitalist market, on the whole.

But after the Second World War, world capitalism has been in the midst of third phase of general crisis and the relative stability of market has disappeared. This is because of very many reasons. Loss of vast territory, emergence of socialist system in the world plane, emergence of national bourgeois states in former colonies and ever expanding grip of the national bourgeoisie on the national market with the help of state power in those states

are some of the important reasons to mention.

But this factor of relative stability of market is an essential pre-requisite for the development of capitalist mode of production. Because the motive force of capitalist process of production lies not in meeting the ever-expanding social demands, in fulfilling the requirements of all round social development but in the expropriation of the fruits of social labour by means of capitalist ownership over means of production.

But as we know: "The conditions of direct exploitation, and those of realising it are not identical. The first are only limited by the productive power of society, the latter by the proportional relation of the various branches of production and the consumer power of society. But this last named is not determined either by the absolute productive power or by the absolute consumer power but by the consumer power based on the antagonistic conditions of distribution which reduce the consumption of the bulk of the society to a minimum varying within more or less narrow limits. It is further more restricted by the tendency to accumulate the drive to expand capital and produce surplus value on an expanded scale..... the more productiveness develops the more it finds itself at variance with the narrow basis on which the conditions of consumption rest. It is no contradiction at all on this self-contradictory basis that there should be an excess of capital simultaneously with a growing surplus population."

(Marx. Capital Vol. III).

But Comrade Shibdas Ghosh reminds us that it was the time Marx was writing when world capitalism was in the competitive phase and had relative stability of market. But in the perspective of third phase of general crisis of world Capitalism which is overall crisis when there

is a distinct trend of capital becoming bureaucratic and idle as an universal feature, the steady decline in purchasing power of the people or for that matter continuous shrinkage of home market makes simply impossible any proposition of uninterrupted industrial development.

As such, faced with this unprecedented crisis, the bourgeoisie have been resorting more and more to palliative measure like giving fillip and subsidies to cottage and small scale industries in the industrial sector similar to their attempt to keep arrested millions of half-fed, half-clad rural people in the small patches of land. They are, thereby, trying to buy extra-lease of life for the thoroughly out-worn capitalist productive system.

It requires however rudimentary knowledge about economic laws to understand that small scale or cottage industries can not have any rule as competitors to big industrial forms run by the monopolists; rather they can only have place in the economy as ancillaries to those big farms at this stage of capitalist development when the national capitalist market has been firmly under the grip of the monopolists and that it has given birth to finance capital or imperialist capital.

Strange however, not trying to realise this concrete fact, the so-called progressives and pseudo-Marxists have been singing in praise of these palliative measures of the bourgeoisie which are nothing but fascist tricks to hoodwink the masses.

Moreover, the Indian bourgeoisie which grew and developed within the womb of British imperial capital have some peculiarities of their own. They bear their birth marks of usury and speculation in their mental make up and attitudes. No wonder, therefore, that the risk-

taking venturesome bourgeoisie who were once called "captains of industry" will be missing in the land where the bourgeoisie came to power at a time when capitalism as a world order is counting its days.

So, the toiling people have no future so long this exploitative, thoroughly out-worn capitalist system, keeps its existence. The only hope lies in up-rooting this system and building in its place a true socialist order under the leadership of a real proletariat party. History has provided no other alternative. Can the working class in our country choose to stagnate?

SUCI Supporters Receive Bullet Injuries

(Contd. from Page 1)

Kalipada Shi and Gunasindhu Barik then attacked the unarmed people with lathis, spears as well as opened fire. As a result 10/12 persons were injured. Madan Sardar, Amulya Bhuiya and Suren Paik received serious injuries and have been admitted to the Kakdip and Bangur Hospital at Calcutta.

Vehemently protesting these onslaughts on the unarmed peasants by the jotedars Comrade Yakub Pailan, Secretary of the South 24 Parganas District Committee of SUCI has in course of a statement urged upon all the left and democratic forces to come forward and stand united to uphold the cause of the landless agricultural labourers, share-croppers and poor peasants.

Just Out

SUCI Publication

On Fascism

Price Rs. 2.00

Available at

48, Lenin Sarani
Calcutta-13